

touch screen panel was input during an interval of the predetermined time period”, “determining whether the touch screen data is generated after the expiration of the predetermined time period” and “repeatedly detecting a series of touch screen data generated from the touch screen panel during an interval of the predetermined periodic time period”, as recited in respectively Claims 1, 7 and 11.

In addressing these features in the above rejection, the Abstract and column 4, lines 26-30, of Lee et al. are being relied on. However, in the Abstract and column 4, lines 26-30, Lee et al. only discloses a pen interrupt that is used to control a power supply. This is made evident in column 4, lines 47-53, of Lee et al., which discloses:

“If so, the system determines whether or not the time during which the touch screen panel 14 is pressed is longer than a predetermined time (STEP 508). If the pen 18 has been pressed against the activation area longer than the predetermined time period, the system is reactivated by instructing the power supply 208 to turn on the system (step 510).”


Based on the above disclosure, it is evident that Lee et al. only discloses determining how long the pen is pressed against an activation area in order to control a power supply. Thus, Lee et al. cannot be reasonably interpreted as disclosing “detecting the touch screen data generated from the touch screen panel was input during an interval of the predetermined time period”, “determining whether the touch screen data is generated after the expiration of the predetermined time period” or “repeatedly detecting a series of touch screen data generated from the touch screen panel during an interval of the predetermined periodic time period”, as required by the claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these features are distinguishable over Tada et al. in view of Lee et al. and Haneda et al. alone or in combination with Koike.

In view of the above-described distinctions, it is respectfully submitted that the invention

of Claims 1-15 is not obvious over Tada et al. in view of Lee et al. and Haneda et al. alone or in combination with Koike. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn so that the present application may proceed to issue.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to kindly telephone the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. If there are any fees due and owing, please charge Deposit Account No. 502-470.

Respectfully submitted,

  
By: Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

Date: 2-19-03

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Steve S. Cha, Esq.  
CHA & REITER  
411 Hackensack Ave, 9<sup>th</sup> floor  
Hackensack, NJ 07601  
Phone: (201)518-5518  
Fax: (201)518-5519

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, DC 20231 on 2/19/03.

Steve S. Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Representative)

 2/19/03  
(Signature and Date)